



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,778	07/22/2003	William A. Briese	15-748D1	6784

28060 7590 03/28/2008  
TAROLLI, SUNDHELM, COVELL & TUMMINO, LLP  
1300 EAST NINTH STREET  
SUITE 1700  
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
----------

BASHORE, ALAIN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1792

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/28/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/624,778	BRIESE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Alain L. Bashore	1792	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16, 19-29 and 46-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16, 19-29 and 46-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12-10-07</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 46-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Crumbach et al ('309).

Crumbach et al discloses a method of controlled dispensing of a material along a length of an elongated window component. The component is moved along a path of travel relative to a material dispensing nozzle at a controlled speed. Bulk supply is present as is the inlet of a metering pump having an outlet coupled to the nozzle to

Art Unit: 1792

dispense the material from the nozzle into contact with a surface of the elongated window component. The speed of the metering pump is regulated to control the rate of flow of the dispensed material from the nozzle. The pressure of the material is monitored and regulated with pressure transducers before the material is dispense from the nozzle. (see abstract, figure elements 6,7, 21,21, 23-25; col 4, lines 3-11).

While Crumbach et al does not explicitly use the word "delivering" or "mechanism" when describing movement from the material from the bulk supply to an inlet of the metering pump it is considered inherent because there is required movement (delivering) of material, and the term "mechanism" in its broadest interpretation can mean simply a pressure difference.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1792

5        Claims 16-18, 23-24, 46-50, 52-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crumbach et al ('309) in view of Geisel et al ('332).

Crumbach et al discloses a method of controlled dispensing of a material along a length of an elongated window component. The component is moved along a path of travel relative to a material dispensing nozzle at a controlled speed. Bulk supply is present as is the inlet of a metering pump having an outlet coupled to the nozzle to dispense the material from the nozzle into contact with a surface of the elongated window component. The speed of the metering pump is regulated to control the rate of flow of the dispensed material from the nozzle. The pressure of the material is monitored and regulated with pressure transducers before the material is dispense from the nozzle. (see abstract, figure elements 6,7, 21,21, 23-25; col 4, lines 3-11).

There is not disclosed:

monitoring the pressure of the material with a pressure transducer before said material is dispensed from the nozzle, and

regulating the pressure of the material delivered to the metering pump based on the pressure sensed by pressure transducers.

With regards to claims 16, 52, and 56, Geisel et al provides a pump control system and provides pressure sensors installed in the inlet and outlet ports of the dispensing pump fpr sensing the fluid pressure across the pump and deriving a

Art Unit: 1792

feedback control signal that is used to control operation of the electrically controllable inlet regulator valve during operation of the systyem to maintain a constant operating pressure across the adhesive dispensing pump. (Col. 3, lines 52-58; col. 10, lines 22-26). The outlet port from the gear pump 14 is supplied through an optional back pressure regulator 17 to the automatically controlled dispensing nozzle 11. (Col. 5, lines 18-20; fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include monitoring the pressure of the material with a pressure transducer before said material is dispensed from the nozzle, and regulating the pressure of the material delivered to the metering pump based on the pressure sensed by pressure transducers because of what is taught by Geisel et al. Geisel et al teaches that the pump control system operates to maintain substantially constant inlet and outlet pressure differences across the dispensing pump thereby making the system relatively insensitive to changes in viscosity of the adhesive being dispensed and allowing adhesives to be dispensed at relatively high pressure (see abstract).

Regarding claims 46-50, as an alternative intrepration where Crumbach et al does not disclose a "pump mechanism", it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to "deliver" the material because Crumbach teaches connection between the bulk supply and the inlet (see fig 1 to Crumbach et al) and Geisel teaches pump control system operates to maintain substantially constant inlet and outlet

Art Unit: 1792

pressure differences across the dispensing pump thereby making the system relatively insensitive to changes in viscosity of the adhesive being dispensed and allowing adhesives to be dispensed at relatively high pressure (see abstract to Geisel et al).

6. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crumbach et al ('309) in view of Geisel et al ('332) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Manser.

There is not disclosed presenting a user interface which allows the user to adjust input parameters for dispensing material from the nozzle.

Manser discloses a user interface which allows the user to adjust input parameters for dispensing material from the nozzle (col 4, lines 30-39).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a user interface which allows the user to adjust input parameters for dispensing material from the nozzle because Manser teaches variations of window components that may require input parameter changes for coating.

7. Claim 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crumbach et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Schuler.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crumbach et al in view of Manser, and further in view of Schuler.

There is not disclosed where the elongated window component is a U-shaped spacer frame, where the input parameter is a width of the spacer frame.

Schuler discloses the elongated window component is a U-shaped spacer frame (7).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include the elongated window component is a U-shaped spacer frame, where the input parameter is a width of the spacer frame because Schuler teaches spacer frames as another type of window component requiring coating.

8        Claims 19 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crumbach et al ('309) in view of Geisel et al ('332) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Mercier et al ('522).

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crumbach et al in view of Manser, and further in view of Mercier et al ('522).

There is not disclosed periodically stopping dispensing, the speed of metering pump dependant on conveyer speed, and input parameters include acceleration and deceleration of the pump.

Mercier et al ('522) discloses operation interruptions (col 1, lines 60-67).



Art Unit: 1792

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include periodically stopping dispensing, the speed of metering pump dependant on conveyer speed, and input parameters include acceleration and deceleration of the pump because Mercier et al ('522) teaches interruptions that affect production.

9. Claims 26-28, 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crumbach et al ('309) in view of Geisel et al ('332) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Lisec.

There is not disclosed speed of metering dependant on type of elongated window component, desired thickness, spacer width.

Lisec discloses disclosed speed of metering dependant on type of elongated window component, desired thickness, spacer width (col 3, lines 63-68; col 4, lines 1-18).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include speed of metering dependant on type of elongated window component, desired thickness, spacer width because Lisec teaches compensation for changes required (col 3, lines 1-37).

10. Claims indicated as allowable in the previous office action have been withdrawn in view of the new rejection made of record.

Art Unit: 1792

***Conclusion***

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alain L. Bashore whose telephone number is 571-272-6739. The examiner can normally be reached on about 7:30 am to 5:00 pm (Mon. thru Thurs.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alain L. Bashore/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792